UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,848	08/22/2003	Aki Niemi	59643.00314	8144

32294 7590 05/04/2006

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.
14TH FLOOR
8000 TOWERS CRESCENT
TYSONS CORNER, VA 22182

EXAMINER	
DESIR, PIERRE LOUIS	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2617	

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/645,848	NIEMI, AKI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Pierre-Louis Desir	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 February 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Art Unit location of your application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 2617.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 02/14/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest at least the feature of transmitting from a first terminal to the server a first message comprising a request for a resource capable of sustaining a conference call, the feature of transmitting from the server to the first terminal a second message comprising the network address.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Schuster discloses a SIP operation, which involves a SIP UAC issuing a request, a SIP proxy server acting as end user location discovery agent, and a SIP UAS accepting UAS accepting the call. The INVITE message is processed by redirect servers, which send back the SIP URL where a callee is reachable (see col. 9, lines 20-34). Also, as disclosed by Applicant, Schuster disclose a first data telephone which transmits an INVITE request to the conference server, which then transmits INVITE request to the second and third data network telephones (col. 22, lines 42-48).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., transmitting an address of a conferencing resource) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the

claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In addition, as discloses above, Shuster discloses that the redirect servers send back the SIP-URL where the callee is reachable (i.e., transmitting from the server to the first terminal a second message comprising the network address).

Applicant further argues that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest at least the feature of allocating by means of the server a network address identifying a resource capable of sustaining the conference call.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. As stated in the Office action on pages 2-3, with Schuster disclosure of the conferencing server transmitting INVITE message together with SIP identifiers to the other terminal, and that data channels are created between them and with the disclosure of the redirect servers send back SIP-URL where the callee is reachable, one skilled in the art would unhesitatingly and obviously conceptualize that Schuster discloses of allocating by means of the server a network address identifying a resource capable of sustaining the conference call. Schuster was combined with Henrikson to show the obviousness of the limitation. Henrikson discloses a method wherein resources are allocated for the conference call (see col. 1, lines 42-48). Therefore, the rejection as written stands.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schuster et al. (Schuster), U.S. Patent No. 6577622, in view of Henrikson et al. (Henrikson), U.S. Patent No. 6870916.

Regarding claim 1, Schuster discloses a method for administering conferencing resources in a communications system comprising a plurality of terminals and a conference server (see abstract), the method comprising: transmitting from a first terminal to the server a first message comprising a request for a resource capable of sustaining a conference call (i.e., SIP invite) (see figs. 2, 10A, 10B, and col. 9, lines 20-28); and transmitting from the server to the first terminal a second message comprising the network address (i.e., redirect servers process an INVITE message by sending back the SIP-URL where the callee is reachable) (see col. 9, lines 33-34).

Although Schuster discloses that the conference server transmits INVITE message together with SIP identifiers to the other terminals, and that data channels are created between the data network telephones and the conference server (although one skilled in the art would unhesitatingly make the argument) (see col. 23, lines 3-16), Schuster does not specifically disclose a method comprising allocating by means of the server a network address identifying a resource capable of sustaining the conference call.

However, Henrikson discloses a method comprising allocating by means of the server a network address identifying a resource capable of sustaining the conference call (i.e., resources are allocated for the conference call, and a conference bridge number and password are distributed to conference participants to permit access and calling to conference bridge) (see col. 1, lines 42-48).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the teachings as described by Henrikson with the teachings of Schuster to have a server allocating appropriate resources, including bridge number (i.e., network address) and appropriate password to facilitate access to the conference call in order to ensure the proper functioning, as related to security, of the conference call process.

Regarding claim 2, Schuster discloses a method (see claim 1 rejection) further comprising the step of transmitting from the first terminal to at least one other terminal a third message comprising the network address (i.e., through the conference server, the first terminal transmits to the other terminals an invite message inherently comprising of the network address) (see figs. 10A-10B, and col. 22, lines 41-61).

Regarding claim 3, Schuster discloses a method (see claim 2 rejection) further comprising initiating connections from the first terminal and the said other terminal to the network address to establish a conference call between the first terminal and the said other terminal (see figs. 10A-10B, col. 22, line 62 to col. 23, line 16).

Regarding claim 4, Schuster discloses a method (see claim 3 rejection) wherein the step of transmitting the third message comprises transmitting from the first terminal to at least two other terminals the third message comprising the network address (see figs. 10A-10B, and col. 22, lines 41-61); and wherein the initiating step comprises initiating connections from the first terminal and the said other terminals to the network address to establish the conference call between the first terminal and the said other terminals (see figs. 10A-10B, col. 22, line 62 to col. 23, line 16).

Regarding claims 5 and 17, Schuster discloses a method and system (see claims 1 and 13 rejections) wherein the messages are SIP messages (see figs. 10A-10B, and col. 9, lines 20-49, and col. 22, lines 41-61).

Regarding claims 6 and 18, Schuster discloses a method and system (see claims 5 and 17 rejections) wherein the first message is an INVITE message (see figs. 10A-10B, and col. 9, lines 20-49, and col. 22, lines 41-61).

Regarding claims 7 and 19, Schuster discloses a method and system (see claims 5 and 17 rejections) wherein the second message is a redirection message (see col. 9, lines 33-34).

Regarding claims 8 and 20, Schuster discloses a method and system (see claims 5 and 17 rejections) wherein the third message is a REFER message (see figs. 10A-10B, and col. 22, lines 41-61).

Regarding claims 9 and 21, Schuster discloses a method and system (see claims 1 and 13 rejections) wherein the network address is a uniform resource identifier (see fig. 10A-10B, and col. 9, lines 20-32).

Regarding claims 10 and 22, Schuster discloses a method and system (see claims 9 and 21 rejections) wherein the network address is a dynamically generated uniform resource identifier (see col. 10, lines 20-29, and lines 50-56).

Regarding claims 11 and 23, Schuster discloses a method and system (see claims 1 and 13 rejections) wherein on establishment of the conference call the resources merges data transmitted to the network by each of the terminals that are parties to the conference call (i.e., mixes incoming data) (see fids. 10A-10B, and col. 23, lines 3-16).

Regarding claim 12, Schuster discloses a conference server for administering conferencing resources in a communications system comprising a plurality of terminals (see abstract), the conference server comprising: a receiver unit for receiving from a first terminal a first message comprising a request for a resource capable of sustaining a conference call (i.e., the conference server receives an INVITE request from the first terminal, which connote the inherency of a receiving unit) (see figs. 2, 10A, 10B, and col. 9, lines 20-28); and a transmission unit for transmitting to the first terminal a second message comprising the network address (i.e., redirect servers process an INVITE message by sending back (from an inherent transmitting unit) the SIP-URL where the callee is reachable) (see col. 9, lines 33-34).

Although Schuster discloses that the conference server transmits INVITE message together with SIP identifiers to the other terminals, and that data channels are created between the data network telephones and the conference server (although one skilled in the art would unhesitatingly make the argument) (see col. 23, lines 3-16), Schuster does not specifically disclose an allocation unit for allocating a network address identifying a resource capable of sustaining the conference call.

However, Henrikson discloses a method comprising allocating by means of the server a network address identifying a resource capable of sustaining the conference call (i.e., resources are allocated (inherency of a allocation unit) for the conference call, and a conference bridge number and password are distributed to conference participants to permit access and calling to conference bridge) (see col. 1, lines 42-48).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the teachings as described by Henrikson with the teachings of Schuster to

have a server allocating appropriate resources, including bridge number (i.e., network address) and appropriate password to facilitate access to the conference call in order to ensure the proper functioning, as related to security, of the conference call process.

Regarding claim 13, Schuster discloses a system (see claim 12 rejection) comprising a conference server and a plurality of terminals including the first terminal (see figs. 10A-10B).

Regarding claim 14, Schuster discloses a system (see claim 13 rejection) wherein the first terminal is adapted to transmit to at least one other terminal a third message comprising the network address (i.e., through the conference server, the first terminal transmits to the other terminals an invite message inherently comprising of the network address) (see figs. 10A-10B, and col. 22, lines 41-61).

Regarding claim 15, Schuster discloses a system (see claim 14 rejection) wherein the first terminal and the said other terminal are adapted to initiate connections to the network address to establish a conference call between the first terminal and the said other terminal (see figs. 10A-10B, col. 22, line 62 to col. 23, line 16).

Regarding claim 16, Schuster discloses a system (see claim 15 rejection) wherein the first terminal is adapted to transmit to at least two other terminals the third message comprising the network address (see figs. 10A-10B, and col. 22, lines 41-61); and wherein the first terminal and the said other terminals are adapted to initiate connections to the network address to establish a conference call between the first terminal and the said other terminals (see figs. 10A-10B, col. 22, line 62 to col. 23, line 16).

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pierre-Louis Desir whose telephone number is (571) 272-779. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00AM- 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Pierre-Louis Desir
04/28/2006

TEMICA BEAMER
PRIMARY EXAMINER